

## INDUSTRIES DEPARTMENT

The 6th March, 1980

No. 22/64/78-II.B(I).—In exercise of the powers conferred by clause 3 of the Paraffin Wax (Supply, Distribution and Price Fixation) Order, 1972, the Governor of Haryana, hereby fixes the following declared price of Paraffin Wax for the whole of the State of Haryana :—

Serial No.	Place of Selling	Rates of different grades of Paraffin Wax per metric tonne inclusive of Central Sales Tax but exclusive of State Sales Tax and other local taxes, if any.	
		140/45 Quality per Metric Tonne	140/45 P. I. Quality per Metric Tonne
		Rs	Rs
1. Ambala City		4,535.00	4,643.00
2. Jagadhari		4,527.00	4,635.00
3. Karnal		4,527.00	4,635.00
4. Panipat		4,520.00	4,628.00
5. Kurukshetra		4,443.00	4,550.00
6. Hissar		4,549.00	4,657.00
7. Mandi Dabwali		4,561.00	4,669.00
8. Sonepat		4,516.00	4,624.00
9. Gurgaon		4,518.00	4,626.00
10. Rohtak		4,432.00	4,540.00
11. Faridabad		4,509.00	4,617.00

Further increase in rates is allowed equal to the difference between rail and road transportation of Paraffin Wax, where rail transport is not available and the material is transported by road.

The 18th March, 1980

No. 27/20/78/2(I)B(I).—In pursuance of the provisions of sub-section (1) of section 7 of the State Financial Corporations Act, 1951 (Act LXIII of 1951), the Governor of Haryana on the recommendations of the Board of Directors of the Haryana Financial Corporation based upon the advice of the Reserve Bank of India, herebs guarantee the repayment of the principal and payment of interest at 6½% per annum in respect of the 17th issue of the Bonds of value upto Rs. 55.00 lakhs (Rupees fifty five-lakhs only) by the Haryana Financial Corporation in the financial year 1979-80 at the issue price of Rs. 100% (at par) maturing on the expiry of ten years.

V. K. SIBAL,

Commissioner &amp; Secretary to Government.

The 20th March, 1980

No. 5(1)(1)2.I.B.II-S3.—An area measuring 700 Bighas comprising the following Khasra numbers in village Aningpu, tehsil and district Faridabad which was previously held under a mining lease for Slica and will become available after the expiry of thirty days from the date of the publication of this

notification in official Gazette, for the grant of mineral concession under the Mines and Mineral (Regulation and Development) Act, 1957 and Mineral Concession Rules, 1960 :—

Village	Khasra Nos.	Area	
		Bighas	Biswas
Anangpur	41	100—00	
	42	100—00	
	51		100—00
	52		100—00
	53		100—00
	54		100—00
	59		100—00
		Total :	700—00
			OR
			60 Hectares.

2. Interested parties holding valid certificate of approval from the Haryana Government under the Mineral Concession Rules, 1960, should apply to the Director of Industries, Haryana, Chandigarh for grant of mining lease, in the prescribed form along with the necessary fee, after thirty days from the date of publication of this notification in the *Haryana Government Gazette*, which is being issued as required under rule 58 of the Mineral Concession Rules, 1960.

3. The requisite fee, etc., should be remitted to the Director of Industries, Haryana, Chandigarh through a Demand Draft drawn on any bank at Chandigarh.

VIRENDRA NATH,  
Joint Secretary to Government, Haryana,  
LABOUR DEPARTMENT

The 4th March, 1980

No. 11(112)-3Lab-80/2809.—In pursuance of the provision of section 17 the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Faridabad in respect of the dispute between the workmen and the management of M/s Ateli Co-operative Marketing-cum-Processing Society, Ltd., Ateli Mandi Mohindergarh) :—

BEFORE SHRI GURMESH PARKASH, PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT, HARYANA  
FARIDABAD

Reference No 50 of 1979

SHRI GANPAT SINGH WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S ATELI CO-OPERATIVE MARKETING-CUM-PROCESSING SOCIETY, LIMITED, ATELI MANDI (MOHINDERGARH).

• Present :—

Shri Bhim Singh Yadav with the workman.

No one is present for the management.

#### AWARD

This reference No. 50 of 1979 has been referred to this Court by the Hon'ble Governor of Haryana,—vide his order No. GG/59-1979, under section 10(i)(c) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 for adjudication the dispute existing Mr. Ganpat Singh, Workman and M/s Ateji Co-operative Marketing-cum-Processing Society, Limited, Ateli Mandi (Mohindergarh). The terms of the reference was :—

Whether the termination of services of Shri Ganpat Singh was justified and in order ? If not, to what relief is he entitled ?

After receiving this references, notice were issued to both the parties and both the parties appeared before this Court. The workman stated before this court that his demand notice be treated as claim statement and the case was fixed for written statement on 13th February, 1980. But on that date no one was present on behalf of the management though on the last hearing manager and the President of the society were present on behalf of the management. In these circumstances, it was ordered by me on 13th February, 1980 that *ex parte* proceedings be held against the management and the case was fixed for the evidence of the workman. The workman examined himself as WW-I and closed his evidence. He stated before this court that he was employed in this management society on 15th August, 1971 and he was terminated by this management without any notice and charge-sheet on 2nd October, 1979. He further stated that when he was terminated his pay was Rs. 390.90 P. M. He stated that he is unemployed since his removal and wants to join this service again.

There is no reason why the solitary statement of this workman on oath should not be relied upon specially when the management chose not to defend this case before this court. I thus relying on the statement of this workman hold that the termination of the services of this workman is unjustified and also not in order. He is liable to be reinstated with full back wages.

GURMESH PARKASH,

Dated, The 21st February, 1980.

Presiding Officer,  
Labour Court, Haryana,  
Faridabad.

Endorsement No. 347, dated 26th February, 1980

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government of Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

GURMESH PARKASH,  
Presiding Officer,  
Labour Court, Haryana,  
Faridabad.

No. 11(112)-3Lab-80/2803.—In pursuance of the provision of section-17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act. No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Faridabad in respect of the dispute between the workmen and the management of M/s Everest Steel Fabricators, Tigaon Road, Ballabgarh :—

BEFORE SHRI GURMESH PARKASH, PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT, HARYANA FARIDABAD

Reference No 65 of 1979

*between*

SHRI RAM CHANDER WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S EVEREST STEEL FABRICATORS, TIGAON ROAD, BALLABGARH

Perent :—

Shri B. M. Gupta for the Workman.

Shri R. C. Sharma for the Management

#### AWARD

This reference No. 65 of 1979 has been referred to this Court by the Hon'ble Governor of Haryana,—*vide* his order No. FD/99-79 under section 10(i)(c) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 for adjudication the dispute existing between Shri Ram Chander workman and M/s Everest Steel Fabricators, Tigaon Road, Ballabgarh. The terms of the reference were :—

Whether the termination of services of Shri Ram Chander was justified and in order? If not, to what relief is he entitled?

After receiving this reference, notices were issued to both the parties and both the parties appeared before this Court and filed their pleadings. Today the case was fixed for the evidence when the workman Shri Ram Chander appeared before this Court and wanted to make a statement. His statement was recorded. He deposed before this court that he has settled his dispute with this management and under the settlement he has received Rs 330 for full and final settlement. He further stated that under settlement he will not be entitled to reinstatement on his previous service.

I thus relying on the statement of Shri Ram Chander workman hold that now there remains no dispute to be adjudicated between the parties. I thus return this reference while giving my award in these terms.

GURMESH PARKASH,

Presiding Officer,  
Labour Court, Haryana,  
Faridabad.

Endorsement No. 350, dated the 28th February, 1980

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government of Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

The 28th February, 1980.

GURMESH PARKASH,  
Presiding Officer,  
Labour Court, Haryana,  
Faridabad.

No. 11(112)-3Lab-80/2804.—In pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Faridabad, in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s. Haryana State Minor Irrigation Tubewell Corporation Ltd., Faridabad.

BEFORE SHRI GURMESH PARKASH, PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT, HARYANA,  
FARIDABAD

Application No. 3 of 1980

Under Section 33-C (2) of the I. D. Act

between

SHRI SURAJ BHAN, APPLICANT AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S HARYANA STATE  
MINOR IRRIGATION TUBEWELL CORPORATION LTD., FARIDABAD

Present:

Shri R. L. Sharma, with the workman.

No one on behalf of the management.

#### AWARD

This application No. 3 of 1980 has been filed by Shri Suraj Bhan under section 33 (c) (2) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 against Haryana State Minor Irrigation and Tubewell Corporation Limited, Faridabad claiming that he is entitled to receive from the Employer money or benefits which are capable of being computable in terms of money and he himself estimated these benefits and money in the tone of Rs. 72,49 under the head wages from 20th June, 1977 to 31st December, 1979.

After receiving this application notice was issued to the management. But no one appeared on behalf of the management on the date fixed. In these circumstances, it was ordered by me on 13th February, 1980 that *ex-parte* proceedings be held against this management and the case was fixed for evidence of the applicant on 19th February, 1980.

On 19th February, 1980 the applicant examined himself as 'A. W. I. He stated before this court that this management terminated him on 20th June, 1977 on which the reference was made by the Governor of Haryana to the Labour Tribunal for adjudication the dispute between him and the management. The Labour Tribunal passed an award on this reference and this award has been published in Haryana Government Gazette, dated 7th August, 1979, part 1st at the page 1352. According to this award it was ordered that this workman should be reinstated with full back wages. Applicant stated before this court that he went to this management again and again but they did not reinstate him and neither paid his back wages. He further stated that on this he filed this application for his wages from 20th June, 1977 to 31st December, 1979 which amounts to Rs. 7,249. After his this statement he closed his evidence.

There is no reason why this statement of applicant should not be relied upon especially when the management choosed not to appear before this court and defend this application. I thus relying on this statement on oath by A.W. I, I order that this applicant is entitled to receive the money Rs. 7,249/- from the management for his wages from 20th June, 1977 to 31st December, 1979.

Dated the 2st February, 1980.

GURMESH PARKASH,

Presiding Officer,

Labour Court, Haryana,

Faridabad.

Endorsement No. 345, dated the 26th February, 1980

Forwarded (two copies) to the Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour & Employment Departments, Chandigarh, as required under Sub-section 4 of section 33 (c) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

GURMESH PARKASH,

Presiding Officer,

Labour Court, Haryana,

Faridabad.

The 7th March, 1980

No. 11(112)-3Lab-80/4129.—In pursuance of the provision of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Faridabad, in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s. Ashok Enterprises (P) Ltd., Faridabad.

**BEFORE SHRI NATHU RAM SHARMA, PRESIDING OFFICER, INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL,  
HARYANA, FARIDABAD**

**Reference No. 303 of 1978**

*between*

**SHRI JOGINDER SINGH, WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S ASHOK  
ENTERPRISES (P) LTD., FARIDABAD**

**Present :**

Shri Amar Singh Sharma, for the workman.

None for the management.

#### **AWARD**

1. By order No. ID/FD/83-78/35017, dated 26th July, 1978, the Governor of Haryana referred the following dispute between the management of M/s Ashoka Enterprises (P) Ltd., Faridabad and its workman Shri Joginder Singh, to this Tribunal, for adjudication, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 :—

Whether the termination of services of Shri Joginder Singh was justified and in order? If not, to what relief is he entitled?

2. On receipt of the order of reference, notices were issued to the parties. The parties appeared and filed their pleadings. On the pleadings of the parties, following issues were framed on 24th July, 1979 :—

1. Whether Shri Joginder Singh was a workman?
2. Whether the factory of the management is closed? If so, when and to what effect?
3. Whether the termination of services of the workman was justified and in order?
4. Relief.

And the case was fixed for the evidence of the workman. The workman obtained 3-4 adjournments. But on 17th December, 1979 the representative for the management did not appear, nor any one from the management appeared. Then the management was proceeded against *ex parte* and the case was fixed for *ex parte* evidence of the workman. The workman examined himself as his own witness. He stated that he was a skilled workman and was appointed in 1972. His services were terminated without any reason or justification. He also stated that the factory of the management has been closed for the last 2-3 months only.

3. I have considered the evidence of the workman. I believe in his statement. I give my award that the termination of services of the workman was neither justified, nor in order. But he is not entitled to reinstatement as the factory has been closed. In the circumstances, the workman is entitled to full back wage; from the date of his termination till the factory was closed. This shall not hamper his other rights in connection with closure, and other dues if any.

NATHU RAM SHARMA,

Dated the 26th February, 1980.

Presiding Officer,  
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,  
Faridabad.

No. 183, dated the 4th March, 1980

Forwarded (Four Copies) to the Secretary to Government, Haryana; Labour & Employment Departments, Chandigarh, as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

NATHU RAM SHARMA,

Presiding Officer,  
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,  
Faridabad.

No. 11(112)-3Lab-80/4131.—In pursuance of the provision of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Faridabad, in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s the Faridabad Central Co-operative Consumer's Stores, Ltd, NIT., Faridabad.

BEFORE SHRI NATHU RAM SHARMA, PRESIDING OFFICER, INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL, HARYANA, FARIDABAD

Reference No. 67 of 1979

*between*

SHRI RAJBIR WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S. THE FARIDABAD CENTRAL CO-OPBRATIVE CONSUMER'S STORES LTD., NIT FARIDABAD

Present :—Shri B. M. Gupta, for the workman.

Shri H. R. Dua, for the management.

#### AWARD

1. By order No. 11/79/8199, dated 22nd February, 1979, the Governor of Haryana referred the following dispute between the management of M/s. The Faridabad Central Cooperative Consumer's Stores Ltd., NIT Faridabad and its workman Shri Rajbir, to this Tribunal, for adjudication, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 :—

Whether the termination of services of Shri Rajbir was justified and in order? If not, to what relief is he entitled?

2. On receipt of the order of reference, notices were issued to the parties. The parties appeared and filed their pleadings. On the pleadings of the parties, following issues were framed on 3rd July, 1979:—

1. Whether the reference is bad for misjoinder and non-joinder of necessary parties?
2. Whether the appointment of the workman was not lawful? If so, to what effect?
3. Whether the termination of services of Shri Rajbir was justified and in order? If not, to what relief is he entitled?

And the case was fixed for the evidence of the management. The management obtained five adjournments but produced no evidence and lastly the representative for the management stated that he had no instructions from the management. The management was proceeded against *ex parte* and *ex parte* evidence of the workman was recorded. The workman stated that he was working under the management since 1st September, 1979 at Rs. 200 as wage, as helper and the management removed him from service without any justification, reasons or grounds. He was unemployed since then. I, believe

in the *ex parte* statement of the workman and give my award that the termination of the services of the workman was neither justified nor in order. He is entitled to reinstatement with continuity of service and with full back wages.

NATHU RAM SHARMA,

Dated 25th February, 1980.

Presiding Officer,  
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,  
Faridabad.

No. 185, dated 4th March, 1980.

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh, as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act.

NATHU RAM SHARMA,

Presiding Officer,  
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,  
Faridabad.

No. 11(112)-3Lab/80/4132.—In pursuance of the provision of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Industrial, Tribunal, Faridabad in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s the Faridabad Central Co-operative Consumer's Store Ltd., NIT, Faridabad

BEFORE SHRI NATHU RAM SHARMA, PRESIDING OFFICER, INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL  
HARYANA, FARIDABAD

Reference No. 72 of 1979

*between*

SHRI [REDACTED] RAM, WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S. THE FARIDABAD CENTRAL CO-OPERATIVE CONSUMER'S STORE LTD, NIT, FARIDABAD

Present.—

Shri B.M. Gupta, for the workman.

Shri H. R. Dua, for the management.

#### AWARD

1. By order No. 8432, dated 26th February, 1979, the Governor of Haryana referred the following dispute between the management of M/s The Faridabad Central Co-operative Consumer's Store Ltd, NIT, Faridabad and its workman Shri Shri Ram, to this Tribunal, for adjudication, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947:—

Whether the termination of services of Shri Shri Ram was justified and in order ? If not, to what relief is he entitled ?

2. On receipt of the order of reference, notices were issued to the parties. The parties appeared and filed their pleadings. On the pleadings of the parties, following issues were framed on 3rd July, 1979:—

- (1) Whether the reference is bad for misjoinder and non-joinder of necessary parties ?
- (2) Whether the appointment of the workman was not lawful ? If so, to what effect ?
- (3) Whether the termination of services of Shri Shri Ram was justified and in order ? If not, to what relief is he entitled ?

And the case was fixed for the evidence of the management. The management obtained 4-5 adjournments and at last their representative stated that he had no instructions from the management. The management led no evidence at all. In the circumstances, the management was proceeded against *ex parte* and the *ex parte* evidence of the workman was recorded. The workman examined himself as his own witness and stated that the termination of his services was not justified. I have

considered the evidence of the workman. I, therefore, give my award that the termination of services of the workman was neither justified, nor in order. He is entitled to reinstatement with continuity of service and with full back wages. I set aside his termination and order accordingly.

NATHU RAM SHARMA,

Dated 22nd February, 1980.

Presiding Officer,  
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,  
Faridabad.

No. 186, dated 4th March, 1980.

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh, as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

NATHU RAM SHARMA,

Presiding Officer,  
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,  
Faridabad.

No. 11(112)-3Lab-80/4133.—In pursuance of the provision of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Faridabad in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s Auto Pins India Regd., Faridabad.

BEFORE SHRI NATHU RAM SHARMA, PRESIDING OFFICER, INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL,  
HARYANA, FARIDABAD

Reference No 287 of 1978

*between*

SHRI RAM KUMAR, WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S. AUTO PINS INDIA  
REGD, FARIDABAD

*Present.—*

Shri P. K. De for the workman.

Shri R. C. Sharma, for the management.

#### AWARD

1. By order No. FD/11/25-N-78/34309, dated 21st July, 1978, the Governor of Haryana referred the following dispute between the management of M/s Auto Pins India Regd., Faridabad and its workman Shri Ram Kumar to this Tribunal, for adjudication, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947:—

Whether the termination of services of Shri Ram Kumar was justified and in order ? If not, to what relief is he entitled ?

2. On receipt of the order of reference, notices were issued to the parties. The parties appeared and filed their pleadings. On the pleadings of the parties, following issues were framed on 15th January, 1979:—

- (1) Whether the workman was a probationer ? If so, to what effect ?
- (2) Whether the termination of services of the workman concerned was justified and in order ?
- (3) If not, to what relief is he entitled ?

And the case was fixed for the evidence of the management. On the next date of hearing neither the workman appeared, nor his representative, so dismissal in default was ordered. Thereafter the representative for the workman made an application for setting aside the *ex parte* order which was set aside and the case was restored to file. The management filed documents and examined Shri B. N. Ahuja their Personnel Officer as MW-1. Then the case was fixed for evidence of the workman. The workman obtained two adjournments but lastly the representative for the workman gave a statement that he had no instructions from the workman and did not want to proceed with the case. Arguments of the management were heard. I now give my finding issueswise.

Issue No. 1.—The management has proved that the workman was a probationer. I decide this issue in favour of the management. The management also proved that the termination of services of the workman were justified. On the contrary there was no evidence of the workman. The case of the management was not rebutted by the workman and even the representative for the workman withdrew. I have considered the evidence of the management. I give my award that the termination of services of the workman was justified and the order. The workman is not entitled to any relief. Previous *ex parte* award in this matter dated 28th March, 1979 is set aside.

NATHU RAM, SHARMA,

Dated 22nd February, 1980.

Presiding Officer,  
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,  
Faridabad.

No. 187, dated 4th March, 1980.

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh, as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act.

NATHU RAM, SHARMA,

Presiding Officer,  
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,  
Faridabad.

No. 11(112)3-Lab-80/4138.—In pursuance of the provision of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Faridabad, in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s Chopra Enterprises Sector-27, Faridabad.

BEFORE SHRI NATHU RAM, PRESIDING OFFICER, INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL, HARYANA,  
FARIDABAD

Reference No. 225 of 1978

*between*

SHRI NATHU, WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S CHOPRA ENTERPRISES  
SECTOR-27, FARIDABAD.

*Present.—*

Shri P. K. De, for the workman.

Shri H. R. Dua, for the management.

#### AWARD

1. By order No. ID/32813, dated 13th July, 1978, the Governor of Haryana referred the following dispute between the management of M/s. Chopra Intergrizes Sector-27, Faridabad and its workman Shri Nathu, to this Tribunal, for adjudication, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (I) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 :—

Whether the termination of services of the workman concerned Shri Nathu was justified and in order ? If not, to what relief is he entitled?

2. On receipt of the order of reference, notice were issued to the parties. The parties appeared and filed their pleadings. On the pleadings of the parties, following issues were framed on 11th July, 1979 :—

(1) Whether the workman resigned his job;

(2) If issue No. 1 is not proved whether the termination of services of the workman was justified and in order ?

(3) Relief.

And the case was fixed for the evidence of the management. The management obtained 4-5 adjournments but led no evidence. And at last the representative for the management stated that he had no instructions from the management. The management was then ordered to be proceeded against *ex parte* and *ex parte* evidence of the workman was recorded. The workman examined himself as WW-1. I have considered the statement of the workman. The termination of his services was neither justified, nor in order. I

therefore, give my award that the termination of services of the workman was neither justified nor in order. He is entitled to reinstatement with continuity of service and with full back wages. I order accordingly.

**NATHU RAM SHARMA,**

Dated 22nd February, 1980

Presiding Officer,  
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,  
Faridabad.

No. 192, dated the 4th March, 1980

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government, Haryana Labour & Employment Departments, Chandigarh, as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act.

**NATHU RAM SHARMA,**

Presiding Officer,  
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,  
Faridabad.

The 11th March, 1980

No. 11(112)-3Lab-80/4202.—In pursuance of the provision of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Faridabad, in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s. Rajesh Rubber Udyog NIT, Faridabad.

**BEFORE SHRI NATHU RAM SHARMA, PRESIDING OFFICER, INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL, HARYANA, FARIDABAD**

Reference No. 177 of 1978

between

**SHRI AMRIT LAL, WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S. RAJESH RUBBER, UDYOG/ NIT, FARIDABAD.**

*Present :—*

Shri Amar Singh Sharma, for the workmen.

Shri A. J. S. Chadha for the management.

#### AWARD

1. By order No. FD/2-N-78/30106, dated 30th June, 1978, the Governor of Haryana referred the following dispute between the management of M/s. Rajesh Rubber, Udyog NIT, Faridabad and its workman Shri Amrit Lal to this Tribunal, for adjudication, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947:—

1. Whether the termination of services of Shri Amrit Lal was justified and in order? If not, to what relief is he entitled?

2. On receipt of the order of reference, notices were issued to the parties. The parties appeared and filed their pleadings. On the pleadings of the parties, following issues were framed on the 29th May, 1979 :—

1. Whether the workman was on purely on trial basis and had relinquished his claims to service and reinstatement?
2. Whether the workman has received in full and final accounts? If so to what effect?
3. Whether the claim statement is bad for not being verified?
4. Whether the workman settled his dispute under section 18(1) of the I. D. Act?
5. Whether the termination of services of the workman was justified in order?
6. Relief.

And the case was fixed for the evidence of the management. The management examined their Manager Shri Paras Ram as MW-1 in *ex parte* proceedings of the management, which had been ordered on the previous date, as neither the workman, nor his representative had appeared. But thereafter the representative for the workman had appeared. Dispute was settled between the parties. The representative for the management stated that they pay bonus to their workmen @ 8.33% and shall be paying the same in future. They shall also continue supply of uniforms and gur to their workmen as they had been continuing heretofore. In consideration of the statement of the representative for the management the representative for the workman withdrew the case. I permitted withdrawal. I, award that there is no dispute between the parties. However, the management shall be bound with the statement given by their representative before this Tribunal as said above, and shall continue giving the above said benefits to their workman.

NATHU RAM SHARMA,

The 28th February, 1980.

Presiding Officer,  
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,  
Faridabad.

No. 211, dated the 5th March, 1980.

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh, as required under Section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

NATHU RAM SHARMA,

Presiding Officer.  
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,  
Faridabad.

No. 11(112)-3Lab-80/4203.—In pursuance of the provision of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Faridabad in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s Janta Metal and Procesion, Sector 24, Faridabad.

BEFORE SHRI NATHU RAM SHARMA, PRESIDING OFFICER, INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL,  
HARYANA, FARIDABAD

Reference No. 327 of 1979

*between*

SHRI SURYA NARAIN, WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S JANTA  
METAL AND PROCESION, SECTOR-24, FARIDABAD.

*Present :—*

None for the workman.

None for the management.

#### AWARD

1. By order No. 31-79/44385, dated 17th October, 1979, the Governor of Haryana referred the following dispute between the management of M/s Janta Metal and Procesion, Sector-24, Faridabad and its workman Shri Surya Narain, to this Tribunal, for adjudication, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 :—

Whether the termination of services of Shri Surya Narain, was justified and in order?  
If not, to what relief is he entitled?

2. On receipt of the order of reference, notices were issued to the parties. The parties did not appear despite service, hence dismissal of the case was ordered in default. I, therefore, give my award that there is no dispute between the parties.

NATHU RAM SHARMA,

Presiding Officer,  
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,  
Faridabad.

Dated the 29th February, 1980.